IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION (PIL) NO. 10 OF 2007

Dr. Aslam Qureshi s/o Abdul Salam ... Petitioner

versus

Municipal Corporation for Greater Mumbai and ors. ...

Respondents

Mr. A.C.Singh, instructed by Mr. V.T. Dubey, for the petitioner.
Mrs. P.A. Purandare for respondent Nos. 1 and 2.

CORAM: **SWATANTER KUMAR, C.J.** &
S.C. DHARMADHIKARI, J.

DATE: **APRIL 05, 2007**.

P.C.

Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, we are of the considered view that the basic principles for invoking the writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, particularly in regard to issuance of mandamus, are not satisfied. It is an undisputed fact that the petitioner has not made any representation or sent notice to the statutory authorities for performance of the duties and requested for remedying his grievance. Counsel appearing for the petitioner prays that this writ petition may be treated as a representation to the authorities and he be granted liberty to file additional documents and

direct the authorities to look into the matter and deal with the same expeditiously. Learned counsel for respondent Nos.1 and 2 submits that she has no objection. She has already received the copy of the writ petition which shall be forwarded by her to the Competent Authority. Liberty to the petitioner to file additional documents, if any, within two weeks from today directly before the concerned authorities, who shall deal with the matter and dispose of the same in accordance with law.

2. Writ Petition is disposed of accordingly.

CHIEF JUSTICE

S.C. DHARMADHIKARI, J.